

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

MDL No. 3084

This Order Relates To:

ALL CASES

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER
PARTY'S MATERIAL SHOULD BE
FILED UNDER SEAL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 2496, 2712, 2727

The Court has reviewed Uber's Dkt. No. 2712 Statement in Support of Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party's Material Should Be Filed under Seal (Dkt. No. 2496) and determined that Uber has failed to show that its proposed redactions are necessary to prevent competitive harm. Therefore, the motion is denied. The Plaintiffs are directed to file unredacted versions of the documents.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 10, 2025



CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge